REMARKS

Careful examination of the application is sincerely appreciated.

Claims 1-4 are pending in the application. Among other things, independent claims 1 and 3 are amended to clarify the patentable subject matter of the invention and advance the prosecution of this case. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

The specification is amended herein to correct an obvious grammatical error.

In the Final Office Action, claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite due to use of the term "or" in the Claim 1. By the amendment of August 25, 2005, unentered according to the Advisory Action of September 22, 2005, the claims have been amended to fully comply with the statute. Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

Further in the Final Office Action, claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by GB 2,335,002 (Rover).

Applicants have previously pointed out that the data carrier of Rover does not transmit its position to the information unit <u>only in case of initialization and in case of movement of the at least one data carrier from the area</u>. Please see Applicants' amendment of August 25, 2005.

6

Furthermore, in the Final Office Action, Rover's remote station 30 is analogized to Applicants' information unit of claims 1 and 3. If this is the case, then nowhere does Rover teach or suggest the following feature of the present invention: "the information unit … for **assigning an area corresponding to said absolute position, determining area boundaries corresponding to the assigned area and transmitting the area boundaries** to the at least one data carrier" (emphasis added). According to Rover, "the security controller 112 sends signals indicative of its positional condition and state as defined by the navigation system 110 and the security controller 112. These signals are **received by the remote station 30** and relayed to the police" (emphasis added; see page 7, lines 7-10 of the patent). Clearly, Rover's remote station 30, analogized to Applicants' information unit, merely receives area information from the vehicle 10: all positional processing is performed in the vehicle 10, and not in the remote station 30 according to Rover. Thus, Rover is unarguably deficient in disclosing the above features of Applicants' claims 1 and 3 and, in fact, teaches away from the present invention.

Pursuant to MPEP, Section 2131, to anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim. As discussed above, Rover fails to teach every element of Applicants' claims 1 and 3. Applicants, therefore, respectfully submit that independent claims 1 and 3 are not anticipated by Rover. Claims 2 and 4

7

respectively depend from one of claims 1 and 3 and accordingly are allowable for at least this reason, as well as for the separately patentable elements contained in each of said claims. Accordingly, separate consideration of each of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, claims 1-4 are patentably distinguishable over the art of record and in condition for allowance.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the Examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited. However, if for any reason this application is not considered to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By_____
Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352
Senior Corporate Counsel
914-333-9602

8